

## ***Record of Preliminary Inquiry w/ Explanation***

Hotline #

Complainant Name/Rank or Grade/Service:

Name

Rank

Job Title and Duty Location:

Job Position

Unit

Base or City, State

(position when allegations were made)

Protected Communications (PC):

- List only what are actual PCs under 10 U.S.C. 1034 (Must mention disposition in either a footnote or a separate disposition document, not SKEs)
- If you determine the complainant has not made a PC as defined by 10 U.S.C. 1034, then insert the following: None.

If complainant alleges other communications resulted in unfavorable personnel actions, but are not PCs as defined by 10 U.S.C. 1034, mention them in a separate paragraph in this section. You must state reason for not considering, i.e., not to designated official under 10 U.S.C. 1034, disagreement with leadership and not gross mismanagement, does not evidence FWA, etc.

Do not list PCs after last unfavorable personnel action.



Hotline number 20XXXXXXX

Unfavorable Personnel Action(s) / Responsible Management Officials / Prior Knowledge:

Date: Unfavorable Personnel Action(s) (UPA)	Responsible Management Official(s) (RMO)	RMO knowledge of PC(s) before taking UPA Ans: Yes, No, or Unk

Only UPAs as determined by the investigator should be placed in the table.

Add any allegation of an UPA that does not meet the criteria under 10 U.S.C. 1034 under the UPA box.

Analysis:

Unfavorable Action (Use for each UPA with separate recommendation section for each UPA)

- If there is no PC, insert the following statement, "Absent a protected communication, there is insufficient evidence to warrant further investigation under 10 U.S.C. 1034."
- Bullets will reference facts in the SKE to provide justification either for or against investigating the case. Information included in the analysis must be corroborated by testimony or documentation. You may use information gleaned from previous

investigations, official personnel files, previous congressional responses, and other official correspondence (email, separations packages).

- Do not cut and paste info from SKE. Combine items such as counseling sheets, Letters of Reprimand, documented incidents, etc. [SKE 2, 4, 6]
- Any additional significant information that might influence the determination of whether the allegations warrant investigation or closure. Questions below are only ticklers and should not be included as written in your final sheet.
  - Did the adverse personnel action occur within a short time following the PC? Or, a long time after the PC? (Any triggering event?)
  - Was the content of a PC critical of an RMO and did the RMO receive any negative action? (If so, explain.)
  - Prior to the PC, did the complainant have a good performance history in the same command? (If so, briefly describe and include dates.)
  - Prior to the PC, did the complainant receive negative counseling (written or oral) regarding performance or conduct issues? (If so, briefly describe and include date.)
  - Did the complainant receive written or oral counseling for "going outside the chain of command?" (If so, explain any significance and include date.)
  - Are there any prior investigations or congressional responses regarding the complainant's reprisal allegations or the UPAs at issue? (If so, briefly explain.)
  - Were the allegations contained in the PCs properly investigated?

Recommendation:

Cite the reasons why you believe the alleged UPA warrants/does not warrant an investigation.

Hotline number 20XXXXXXX

Final Recommendation:

Close case/refer for investigation/close specific allegations as mentioned in separate recommendations for each UPA above.

Be specific in tasking other issues to the Service component or the Defense Hotline.

Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name Date

Team Leader: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name Date

### ***Sequence of Key Events w/ Explanation*** **(Complainant's Rank/Name/Service)**

The purpose of the sequence of events is to chronologically tell the story (clearly and concisely) and document the facts as identified in the preliminary process (documents and complainant interview). The bullets may contain more information than the Record of Preliminary Inquiry (RPI). This document should be referenced in your RPI as you analyze each unfavorable action. Style is as follows:

1. On date, such and such. (Facts must be supported by documents or testimony. Previous official statements (ie. investigation into PC) may be used as facts if the statements were officially recorded.)
2. According to xx, such and such. (Statements by the complainant or witnesses must be identified as such. Statements should demonstrate or support a fact, not an opinion.)